



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/530,219

03/31/2005

Tomohiro Yamada

OMOR-0010

1261

23377 7590 04/15/2008

WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP
CIRA CENTRE, 12TH FLOOR
2929 ARCH STREET
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-2891

EXAMINER

SHECHTMAN, SEAN P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2121

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/15/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/530,219	Applicant(s) YAMADA ET AL.	
	Examiner Sean P. Shechtman	Art Unit 2121	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 March 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4 and 6-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4 and 6-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 March 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract is not limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Objections

2. Claims 14, 15 are objected to because of the following informalities: Referring to claims 14-15, lines 6-8, "and comprising" should be "comprising". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 14, 15, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention. Referring to claim 14, 15, line 6, "parts consisting of the product" is unclear. Specifically, it is unclear how a list of parts of a product can have a list of partially assembled parts consisting of the product, since it would seem that parts would not consist of the product, but rather the product would consist of parts. For purposes of examination, it will be assumed claims 14, 15, parallel the preamble of claim 1 in regard to this limitation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claims 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Although the claim is directed to a system comprising various means, all of the means could reasonably be interpreted by one of ordinary skill in the art, in light of the instant specification (page 7, lines 10- page 8, line 15), to be software, such that the system comprising various means is software, per se. Computer programs claimed as computer listings per se, i.e., the descriptions or expressions of the programs, are not physical "things." They are neither computer components nor statutory processes, as they are not "acts" being performed. Such claimed computer programs do not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and other claimed elements of a computer which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized. In contrast, a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a computer program is a computer element which defines structural and functional interrelationships between the computer

program and the rest of the computer which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory. See Lowry, 32 F.3d at 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d at 1035.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1, 14, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pub. No. 2001/0056488 to Maeda et al (hereinafter referred to as Maeda), which is the U.S. Application Publication corresponding to EP1152362 to Maeda, previously relied upon for the rejection, which was previously supplied by applicant.

Referring to claims 1, 14, 15, Maeda teaches a method/computer/system/instruction means stored in said storage medium for generating a parts catalog of a product from three dimensional data and a parts list of the product (For example, Fig. 10, paragraphs 203-207), wherein the parts catalog comprises the parts list (For example, Fig. 10, element 1462) and a disassembled illustration of the product (For example, Fig. 10, element 1461); said three dimensional data comprising assembly structure information of the product (For example, Fig. 10,

element 1461); and the parts list being a list of parts or partially assembled parts of the product (For example, Fig. 10, element 1462) and wherein a user creates said parts list and (Figs. 60-61, 64, paragraphs 427-430, character data fed via keyboard includes index No., ID No., name, used numbers);

the method comprising the steps of: assigning a reference numeral/ symbol to said parts and partially assembled parts in the parts list (Figs. 60-61, paragraphs 427-430, character data fed via keyboard includes index No.), building a disassembly algorithm based on said parts list (paragraph 252, data of part stored in parts table of the drawing; Figs. 37, 38, paragraph 329-330, drawing table stores graphic data and parts table stores index No. of the parts for those graphics; paragraph 228, referring back to Fig. 10, element 1461 and paragraphs 203-207, element 1461 comprises image data with drawing AND the index No. attached to the parts of the drawing); and generating disassembly illustrations based on said disassembly algorithm (For example, Fig. 10, element 1461), wherein maximal disassembled states in the disassembly illustrations are the parts and partially assembled parts assigned with said reference numeral/symbols (For example, Fig. 10, element 1461 with index Nos.), and displaying said reference numeral/symbol for each of the parts and partially assembled parts in the disassembly illustrations (For example, Fig. 10, element 1461 with index Nos.); or

the method comprising the steps of: assigning a reference symbol to said parts and partially assembled parts in the parts list (Figs. 37, 38, paragraph 329-330, drawing table stores graphic data and graphic data are symbols shown for parts in for example, Fig. 10; Figs. 37, 38, paragraph 329-330, drawing table stores graphic data and parts

table stores index No. of the parts for those graphics), building a disassembly algorithm based on said parts list (paragraph 252, data of part stored in parts table of the drawing; Figs. 37, 38, paragraph 329-330, drawing table stores graphic data and parts table stores index No. of the parts for those graphics; paragraph 228, referring back to Fig. 10, element 1461 and paragraphs 203-207, element 1461 comprises image data with drawing AND the index No. attached to the parts of the drawing); and generating disassembly illustrations based on said disassembly algorithm (For example, Fig. 10, element 1461), wherein maximal disassembled states in the disassembly illustrations are the parts and partially assembled parts assigned with said reference symbols (For example, Fig. 10, element 1461 with graphic data of parts shown), and displaying said reference symbol for each of the parts and partially assembled parts in the disassembly illustrations (For example, Fig. 10, element 1461 with graphic data of parts shown).

6. Claims 1, 3, 4, 7-10, 14, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 7,075,531 to Ando et al (hereinafter referred to as Ando).

Referring to claims 1, 14, 15, Ando teaches a method/computer/system/instruction means stored in said storage medium for generating a parts catalog of a product from three dimensional data and a parts list of the product (Fig. 3; Col. 3, lines 48-55; Col. 4, lines 5-36; Col. 5, lines 4-55), wherein the parts catalog comprises the parts list (Fig. 3, elements 32 and 30; Col. 5, lines 43-55) and a disassembled illustration of the product (Fig. 3, disassembled illustration of the

product); said three dimensional data comprising assembly structure information of the product (Fig. 3; Col. 5, lines 4-55);

the method comprising the steps of: assigning a reference numeral/ symbol to parts and partially assembled parts in the parts list (Col. 6, lines 50-55);

and the parts list being said list of parts or partially assembled parts of the product and wherein a user creates said parts list and (Fig. 3, elements 32 and 30; Col. 5, lines 43-63, operator specifying/editing is creating);

the method comprising the steps of: building a disassembly algorithm based on said parts list (Col. 5, lines 43-64; Col. 6, lines 22-49); and generating disassembly illustrations based on said disassembly algorithm (Col. 6, lines 22-49; Col. 6, lines 56 – Col. 7, line 35), wherein maximal disassembled states in the disassembly illustrations are the parts and partially assembled parts assigned with said reference numeral/symbols (Fig. 3, disassembled illustration of the product), and displaying said reference numeral/symbol for each of the parts and partially assembled parts in the disassembly illustrations (Col. 6, lines 50-55).

Referring to claims 3, 4, 7-10, Ando teaches the parts list includes disassembly definition information comprising a tree structure consisting of a nodes and leave, which are processes and parts, respectively, wherein the node comprises a basic process (Fig. 3, elements 32, 30; Col. 5, lines 43-63; Col. 6, line 56 – Col. 7, line 35). Language that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation (MPEP 2106 [R-5]). Wherein said step (b) generates the disassembly

algorithm by adding to the parts list, a moving coordinate system of said basic process, and a respective moving position of the parts within said moving coordinate system, that are determined based on the disassembly definition information of said parts list (Fig. 3, elements 32, 30; Col. 5, lines 43-63; Col. 6, line 1 – Col. 7, line 35); further comprising the step of (d) modifying the disassembly algorithm and illustrations after generating the disassembly illustrations (Col. 5, lines 43-63); wherein said step (d) modifies each of the disassembly illustrations by modifying a position, a bearing or a scale of each of the parts (Col. 5, lines 43-63); wherein said step (d) generates and presents a user interface for modifying the position, bearing or scale for each of the parts or parts groups (Fig. 3; Col. 5, lines 43-63); wherein said step (d) permits modification of a camera view point information to modify the disassembly illustration (Col. 5, lines 43-63; Col. 6, lines 8-22).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

7. Claims 3, 4, 7-10, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maeda as applied to claims 1, 14, 15 above, and further in view of EP 1288868 to Kawai (hereinafter referred to as Kawai).

Referring to claims 3, 4, 7-10, Maeda teaches all of the limitations set forth above however fails to teach the parts list includes disassembly definition information comprising a tree structure consisting of a nodes and leave, which are processes and parts, respectively, wherein the node comprises a basic process. Language that

suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation (MPEP 2106 [R-5]). Wherein said step (b) generates the disassembly algorithm by adding to the parts list, a moving coordinate system of said basic process, and a respective moving position of the parts within said moving coordinate system, that are determined based on the disassembly definition information of said parts list; further comprising the step of (d) modifying the disassembly algorithm and illustrations after generating the disassembly illustrations; wherein said step (d) modifies each of the disassembly illustrations by modifying a position, a bearing or a scale of each of the parts; wherein said step (d) generates and presents a user interface for modifying the position, bearing or scale for each of the parts or parts groups; wherein said step (d) permits modification of a camera view point information to modify the disassembly illustration.

However, referring to claims 3, 4, 7-10, Kawai teaches a method/computer/system/instruction means stored in said storage medium for generating a parts catalog of a product from three dimensional data and a parts list of the product, wherein the parts catalog comprises the parts list and a disassembled illustration of the product; wherein the parts list includes disassembly definition information comprising a tree structure consisting of a nodes and leave, which are processes and parts, respectively, wherein the node comprises a basic process (Fig. 3, Col. 5, lines 8-21); wherein Kawai generates the disassembly algorithm by adding to the parts list, a moving coordinate system of said basic process, and a respective moving

position of the parts within said moving coordinate system, that are determined based on the disassembly definition information of said parts list (Col. 6, lines 44-58; Fig. 8); further comprising the step of (d) modifying the disassembly algorithm and illustrations after generating the disassembly illustrations; wherein said step (d) modifies each of the disassembly illustrations by modifying a position, a bearing or a scale of each of the parts (Fig. 8-9; Col. 6, line 4 – Col. 7, line 1); wherein said step (d) generates and presents a user interface for modifying the position, bearing or scale for each of the parts or parts groups (Figs. 2-9); wherein said step (d) permits modification of a camera view point information to modify the disassembly illustration (Col. 6, line 43 – Col. 7, line 1). Language that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation (MPEP 2106 [R-5]).

Maeda and Kawai are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, producing an exploded view of parts/products.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify the teachings of Maeda with the teachings of Kawai.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine these references because Kawai teaches an exploded view automatic creation device, an exploded view automatic creation method and a storage media thereof by which an exploded view can be easily created. The shape data of the parts of the objective product and the disassembling condition data necessary for creating exploded view are

stored in the storage means. The exploded view is created by changing the positioning of the parts constructed from the shape data based on the disassembling condition data. Thus, the exploded view is automatically created when providing the assembling operation instruction manual for the objective product and the exploded view can be obtained easily without troublesome drawing operation. The shape data of the parts of the objective product and the disassembling condition data necessary for creating the exploded view are stored in the storage means. The exploded view of the design drawing regarding the objective product is created by changing the positioning of the parts constructed from the shape data based on the disassembling condition data in accordance with an exploded view creation command. The exploded view is outputted to the output means. Thus, the exploded view is automatically treated when providing an assembling operation instruction manual regarding the objective product. Accordingly, the exploded view can be easily obtained without bothersome drawing operation (Col. 1, line 41 – Col. 3, line 34).

8. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ando alone or Maeda in view of Kawai as applied to the claims above, and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,619,630 to Minami et al (hereinafter referred to as Minami).

Referring to claim 6, Ando alone or Maeda in view of Kawai teaches all of the limitations set forth above however fails to teach a shape of each of the parts or parts groups is approximated with a circumscribing polygon thereof, and the moving position

is set such that each polygon is at a minimum distance from each other which is greater than a predetermined ratio.

However, Minami teaches analogous art wherein a shape of each of the parts or parts groups is approximated with a circumscribing polygon thereof, and the moving position is set such that each polygon is at a minimum distance from each other which is greater than a predetermined ratio (Col. 42, line 30 – Col. 43, line 15).

Ando alone or Maeda in view of Kawai and Minami are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, producing an exploded view of parts/products.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify the teachings of Ando alone or Maeda in view of Kawai with the teachings of Minami.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine these references because Minami teaches the manpower for producing an exploded view can be decreased by eliminating the operator's conventional work to move parts by individually specifying a moving direction and a moving amount for each part (Col. 3, lines 26-30).

9. Claims 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ando alone or Maeda in view of Kawai as applied to the claims above, and further in view of JP 2003-006245 to Aragaki (hereinafter referred to as Aragaki), supplied by applicant.

Referring to claims 11-12, Ando alone or Maeda in view of Kawai teaches all of the limitations set forth above however fails to teach modifying the disassembly illustration by determining an interference among the parts during the movements thereof and by modifying the position, bearing or scale for each of the parts or parts groups in the processes; wherein said interference among the parts or parts groups during the movements thereof is determined by calculating the interference among respective polygons circumscribed around each of the parts or parts groups.

However, Aragaki teaches analogous art comprising: modifying the disassembly illustration by determining an interference among the parts or parts groups during the movements thereof for each of the basic, intermediate and the connecting processes, wherein the basic, intermediate and connecting processes constitute the disassembly definition information, and by modifying the position, bearing or scale for each of the parts or parts groups in the processes; wherein said interference among the parts or parts groups during the movements thereof is determined by calculating the interference among respective polygons circumscribed around each of the parts or parts groups (whole document; see also the international search report of the instant application).

Ando alone or Maeda in view of Kawai and Aragaki are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, shape processing.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify the teachings of Ando alone or Maeda in view of Kawai with the teachings of Aragaki.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine these references because Aragaki teaches a shape processor which can automatically create a plan in the state of decomposition (Abstract). Furthermore, Aragaki teaches detecting interference between modeled parts during movement and moving the modeled parts to avoid the interference (Abstract).

10. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ando alone or Maeda in view of Kawai as applied to the claims above, and further in view of “Automatic Arrangement of Meta-Objects in Assembly Illustrations” to Katsuma (hereinafter referred to as Katsuma), supplied by applicant.

Referring to claim 13, Ando alone or Maeda in view of Kawai teaches all of the limitations set forth above however fails to teach the step of drawing a lead line from each of parts and parts groups within the disassembly illustration in order to display said reference numeral/symbol, wherein said step of drawing a lead line projects a movement vector from a pre-disassembly position to a post-disassembly position for said parts and parts groups, onto a plane perpendicular to a view point vector from a view point, and draws said lead line for said reference numeral/symbol from a post-movement object along an axis direction of a shorter component of analyzed vector components constituting such a projected vector.

However, Katsuma teaches analogous art comprising: the step of drawing a lead line from each of parts and parts groups within the disassembly illustration in order to display said reference numeral/symbol, wherein said step of drawing a lead line projects

a movement vector from a pre-disassembly position to a post-disassembly position for said parts and parts groups, onto a plane perpendicular to a view point vector from a view point, and draws said lead line for said reference numeral/symbol from a post-movement object along an axis direction of a shorter component of analyzed vector components constituting such a projected vector (whole document; see also the international search report of the instant application).

Ando alone or Maeda in view of Kawai and Katsuma are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, assembly illustrations.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify the teachings of Ando alone or Maeda in view of Kawai with the teachings of Katsuma.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to draw a lead line, as taught by Katsuma, to link or associate non-graphic information with a graphic entity, thereby increasing the modeling accuracy.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments filed 3/13/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant appears to argue that Maeda fails to teach a user creates a parts list. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Maeda teaches and shows a parts list in Fig. 61 and/or parts list in Fig. 64, element 442 created by character data fed via keyboard that includes index No., ID No., name, used numbers (Figs. 60-61, 64, paragraphs 427-430, character data fed via keyboard includes index No., ID No., name, used numbers). The

examiner respectfully submits that a parts list created by character data fed via keyboard that includes index No., ID No., name, used numbers is a user creating a parts list.

Applicant argues that Maeda fails to teach generating a parts catalog of a product from three dimensional data, wherein the parts catalog comprises a disassembled illustration of the product. The examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner respectfully submits that Fig. 10, for example, shows a parts catalog of a product. Maeda clearly shows a disassembled illustration in Fig. 10, element 1461. Maeda shows element 1461 made from parts/graphics data in 3D perspective, and further teaches the graphics data from drawing table (Figs. 37, 38, paragraph 329-330, drawing table stores graphic data and parts table stores index No. of the parts for those graphics). The examiner respectfully submits that Fig. 10 which includes element 1461 made from parts/graphics data in 3D perspective from drawing table is generating a parts catalog of a product, comprising a disassembled illustration of the product, from three dimensional data.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., a user defines a parts list; importing 3-dimensional information used by a user to define a parts list; disassembly definition information is user-defined processes that define the order of assembling/disassembling and each process node is a basic unit of process animation where attributes of each animation section is defined; parts numbers assigned in any order of actual assembling or disassembling; creating process trees,

Art Unit: 2121

etc, etc) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims.

See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sean P. Shechtman whose telephone number is (571) 272-3754. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30am-6:00pm, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Leo P. Picard can be reached on (571) 272-3749. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SPS

Sean P. Shechtman

Application/Control Number: 10/530,219
Art Unit: 2121

Page 18

April 11, 2008

/Sean P. Shechtman/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2121